arXiv:0710.1290v3 [math.AP] 12 Jan 2008

LIMITING JUMP CONDITIONS FOR JOSEPHSON JUNCTIONS IN GINZBURG-LANDAU THEORY

AYMAN KACHMAR*

Abstract. We consider a S-N-S Josephson junction modeled through the Ginzburg-Landau theory. When the normal material is sufficiently thin and the applied magnetic field is below the critical field of vortex nucleation, we prove to leading order that jump boundary conditions of the type predicted by de Gennes are satisfied across the junction.

Introduction

The superconducting proximity effect in a normal metal adjacent to a superconductor has received a lot of attention by the physics community, see [10] for a review of this phenomenon. This is also the setting of the Josephson tunneling effect for superconducting-normal-superconducting junctions (SNS), where a supercurrent flows through the normal layer provided that it is sufficiently thin.
The physics literature contains several approaches to model the Josephson effect in the frame work of the Ginzburg-Landau theory of superconductivity. The first modeling in this context is perhaps due to the physicist de Gennes [12]. In the setting of [12], the complex-valued wave function (whose modulus measures the density of superconducting electrons) and its derivative are related linearly on both sides of the normal material, in such a manner that the supercurrent is conserved through the junction.
In this paper, we use a generalized Ginzburg-Landau energy functional presented in [9], which has proved to account rigorously to various physical aspects (c.f. [19, 20]). By working in the London singular limit (high κ-regime), we justify asymptotically the modeling of [12] provided that the applied magnetic field is below the critical field of vortex nucleation, see Theorems 1.1 & 1.5.
We also mention in this direction that another justification of the de Gennes modeling is present in a paper of Rubinstein-Schatzman-Sternberg [23], who deal with geometric junctions (weak links) in the framework of the Ginzburg-Landau theory. We hope to carry out in a forthcoming work a deeper analysis valid for higher applied magnetic fields and which provides more details concerning the supercurent flow and the distribution of vortices in the junction.

1. Main results

We move now to the mathematical set-up of the problem. Let $\Omega = D(0,1)$ denotes the unit disc in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Given $R \in]0,1[$ and $\ell \in]0,R[$, we introduce the following partition of Ω,

$$\Omega = S \cup \overline{N},$$

Date: February 2, 2008.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35J60; Secondary 35J20, 35J25, 35B40, 35Q55, 82D55.

* Université Paris-Sud, Département de mathématique, Bât. 425, 91405 Orsay France. *E-mail:* `ayman.kachmar@math.u-psud.fr`.

where

$$N = \{x \in \Omega \ : \ \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial D(0,R)) < \ell\}, \tag{1.1}$$

$$S_1 = D(0, R-\ell), \quad S_2 = D(0,1) \setminus D(0, R+\ell), \quad S = S_1 \cup S_2. \tag{1.2}$$

We shall suppose that S is the cross section of a cylindrical superconductor with infinite height and that N is that of a normal material. By this way, we get a S-N-S Josephson junction.

In Ginzburg-Landau theory [13], the superconducting properties are described by a complex valued wave function ψ, called the 'order parameter', whose modulus $|\psi|^2$ measures the density of the superconducting electron Cooper pairs (hence $\psi \equiv 0$ corresponds to a normal state), and a real vector field $A = (A_1, A_2)$, called the 'magnetic potential', such that the induced magnetic field in the sample corresponds to $\mathrm{curl}\, A$. Since, the superconducting Cooper electron pairs can diffuse from the superconducting to the normal material in a normal-superconducting junction, we then have to consider pairs (ψ, A) defined on Ω.

The basic postulate in the Ginzburg-Landau theory is that the pair (ψ, A) minimizes the Gibbs free energy, which has in our case the following dimensionless form [9] :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi, A) \ = \ & \int_\Omega |(\nabla - iA)\psi|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}\int_S (1 - |\psi|^2)^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ & + \frac{a}{\varepsilon^2}\int_N |\psi|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega |\mathrm{curl}\, A - H|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

Here, $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} = \kappa$ is a characteristic of the superconducting material (filling S), $H > 0$ is the intensity of the applied magnetic field and $a > 0$ is related to the critical temperature of the material in N. The positive sign of a means that we are above the critical temperature of the material filling N.

Minimization of the functional (1.3) will take place in the space

$$\mathcal{H} = H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C}) \times H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

We will be interested in the analysis of the asymptotic behaviour of the minimizers of (1.3) as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (London Limit) and when the thickness of the ring N is small by taking $\ell = \ell(\varepsilon) \ll 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

According to [15], the functional (1.3) admits a minimizer (ψ, A) in the space $\mathcal{H}$. Our main result is the leading order asymptotic expansion of the jump of $(\nabla - iA)\psi$ across the junction, i.e. across the boundary of N, provided that the order parameter ψ is not possessing vortices.

In order to fix ideas, given a function $f \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{C})$, we introduce the *jump of* f *across* N by

$$[f]_N(\theta) = f\left((R+\ell)\, e^{i\theta}\right) - f\left((R-\ell)\, e^{i\theta}\right), \quad \forall\, \theta \in [0, 2\pi[\,. \tag{1.4}$$

Our first result concerns the case of very thin rings, of thickness comparable with ε.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega = D(0,1)$, S and N as in (1.1), (1.2), and $(\psi_\varepsilon, A_\varepsilon)$ be a minimizer of (1.3). Given $d > 0$ and $a > 0$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that, if the applied magnetic field satisfies*

$$H \leq \lambda |\ln \varepsilon|\,, \tag{1.5}$$

and if $\ell = d\,\varepsilon$, then $|\psi_\varepsilon| > 0$ and we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left\| \varepsilon \left[\frac{n(x)\cdot(\nabla - iA_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon}{\psi_\varepsilon}\right]_N - 2\sqrt{a}\,\frac{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d) - 1}{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d) + 1} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} = 0\,, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left\| \, [\psi_\varepsilon]_N \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} = 0\,. \tag{1.7}$$

Here, $n(x)=\dfrac{x}{|x|}$ *for all* $x\in\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\{0\}$*, is the unit outward normal vector of any disc in* $\mathbb{R}^2$*.*

Remark 1.2. *The regime concerning the applied magnetic field* H *in Theorem 1.1 corresponds to that below the first critical field : When (1.10) is satisfied, the order parameter* ψ_ε *has no vortices in* Ω*.*
On the other hand, it is well known (c.f. [26]*) that there exists* $\lambda'>0$ *such that if* $H\geq\lambda'|\ln\varepsilon|$*, the order parameter* ψ_ε *has vortices. However, we are not able to calculate the critical value* λ_c *for which*

$$H_{C_1}\sim\lambda_c|\ln\varepsilon|\quad\text{as}\quad\varepsilon\to0\,.$$

This is due to the technical difficulty arising from the very rapid oscillations of the maximal superconducting density in N*, see Section 2 for more details concerning this point.*

Remark 1.3. *Notice that if one formally makes* $d\to0$ *in (1.6), one would obtain that the jump across* N *tends to* 0*. This agrees with experimental and theoretical predictions that the Josephson effect would be absent in junctions made up of very thin normal materials, see* [9]*.*

Remark 1.4. *Let us introduce the vectors*

$$X_\varepsilon^-=\begin{pmatrix}\varepsilon\, n(x)\cdot(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon\left((R-\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)\\ \psi_\varepsilon\left((R-\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)\end{pmatrix},$$

$$X_\varepsilon^+=\begin{pmatrix}\varepsilon\, n(x)\cdot(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon\left((R+\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)\\ \psi_\varepsilon\left((R+\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)\end{pmatrix},\quad\forall\,\theta\in[0,2\pi[\,,$$

and the matrix

$$M_{a,d}=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 2\sqrt{a}\,\dfrac{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)-1}{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)+1}\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, (1.6) and (1.7) can be written in the equivalent form

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left\|X_\varepsilon^+-M_{a,d}X_\varepsilon^-\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0,\tag{1.8}$$

which justifies the boundary condition postulated by de Gennes in [12]*.*

For thicker rings, we have a result analogous to that of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.5. *Let* $\Omega=D(0,1)$*,* S *and* N *as in (1.1), (1.2), and* $(\psi_\varepsilon,A_\varepsilon)$ *be a minimizer of (1.3). Assume in addition that* $\ell=\ell(\varepsilon)$ *satisfies,*

$$\varepsilon\ll\ell(\varepsilon)\quad(\varepsilon\to0),\quad\exists\,c>0,\ \forall\,\varepsilon\in]0,1],\ \ell(\varepsilon)\leq c\,\varepsilon\ln|\ln\varepsilon|\,.\tag{1.9}$$

Then, given $a>0$*, there exists* $\lambda>0$ *such that, if the applied magnetic field satisfies*

$$H\leq\lambda\exp\left(-\frac{2\sqrt{a}\,\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\right)|\ln\varepsilon|\,,\tag{1.10}$$

we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left\|\varepsilon\left[\frac{n(x)\cdot(\nabla-iA_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon}{\psi_\varepsilon}\right]_N-2\sqrt{a}\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0\,,\tag{1.11}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left\|\,[\psi_\varepsilon]_N\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0\,.\tag{1.12}$$

Here, $n(x)=\dfrac{x}{|x|}$ *for all* $x\in\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\{0\}$*, is the unit outward normal vector of any disc in* $\mathbb{R}^2$*.*

Notice that the result of Theorem 1.5 agrees with that of Theorem 1.1 when one takes formally $d \to +\infty$ in (1.6).

We mention also that the result of Theorem 1.5 is valid for magnetic fields slightly much lower than that of Theorem 1.1. Technically, this is due to the fact that we can not exclude the energy of vortices in N (see Section 2). But heuristically, the reason is that the maximal superconducting density (i.e. the positive minimizer of (1.3) for $H = 0$) in the regime of Theorem 1.5 is small inside the junction, hence the price of a vortex becomes for magnetic fields less than that of Theorem 1.1. However, we were not able in this case to prove that the critical field for vortex nucleation has the order of $\exp\left(-\frac{2\sqrt{a}\,\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\right)|\ln\varepsilon|$, though theoretical predictions in the physics literature say that vortices in N would be present for magnetic fields much below than that of a bulk superconductor, see [10].

The result of Theorem 1.5 is still valid up to lengths $\ell(\varepsilon) = c_*\,\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|$, where $c_* \in]0,1[$ is sufficiently small (this can be checked through minor modifications of the argument). However, since the corresponding magnetic field will be small $H \ll 1$, we do not focus on this last regime[1].

As a by-product of the analysis that we shall carry out, we get a result concerning the conservation of the current across N. The current is defined as the vector field

$$j_\varepsilon = \big(i\psi_\varepsilon, (\nabla - iA_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon\big) = \big((i\psi_\varepsilon, (\partial_2 - iA^1_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon), (i\psi_\varepsilon, (\partial_2 - iA^2_\varepsilon)\psi_\varepsilon)\big)\,, \tag{1.13}$$

where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the scalar product in $\mathbb{C}$ when identified with $\mathbb{R}^2$.
The exact result concerning the current is the following.

Theorem 1.6. *In both regimes of Theorems 1.1 & 1.5, the circulation of the current is almost conserved across the junction:*

$$\left|\int_{|x|=R+\ell} \tau(x)\cdot j_\varepsilon - \int_{|x|=R-\ell} \tau(x)\cdot j_\varepsilon\right| = \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{1/2}|\ln\varepsilon|\right) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0\,, \tag{1.14}$$

where $\tau(x) = \frac{x^\perp}{|x|}$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$.

Finally, we comment on some past work concerning non-homogeneous superconductors and pinning models. Unlike to our situation, pinning models previously considered correspond to a term in the Ginzburg-Landau functional having the form $(a - |\psi|^2)^2$, with a being a smooth function. The first analytic work probably goes back to [1], where $a = a_\varepsilon$, assumed always positive, may depend on ε with the restriction that it can not oscillate quicker than $|\ln\varepsilon|$ ($|\nabla a_\varepsilon| \le C|\ln\varepsilon|$). Compared with our situation, the discontinuity of the coefficients leads to an order parameter oscillating between 0 and u_ε with $|\nabla u_\varepsilon| \ge \frac{C}{\varepsilon}$ in a thin neighborhood of ∂S. Later, in [6], the authors deal with the case when a has isolated zeros, and prove that vortices appear first at the zeros of a for magnetic fields having order 1. In [4], the authors allow the function a to have negative values, but the hypothesis of its smoothness forces the order parameter to be small on the boundary of the normal side (hence, the surface superconducting sheath in the normal side is absent). Moreover, the situation in [4] is more related to the case of domains with holes and relies on the analysis carried out by the same authors in [3]. More recently, the author of the present paper showed in [18] that pinning of vortices is observed for magnetic fields near the first critical field when the function a is a step function. Let us also mention the very recent work of Alama, Bronsard and Sandier in [5] where a layered superconducting model has been investigated. There, the expression of the critical field above which vortices are detected depends strongly on the thickness of the normal regions separating the superconducting layers.

---

[1] It is more likely that the regime $H \ll 1$ is treated, without additional restrictions on the decay of H, by bifurcation arguments. In the present paper, we treat in detail the case $H = 0$.

Organization of the paper.
Section 2 is devoted to a description of the main points of the argument.
Section 3 is devoted to a preliminary analysis of the minimizers of (1.3).
Section 4 is devoted to an analysis of an auxiliary variational problem (this is the variational problem (2.5) describing the Meissner state).
Section 5 is devoted to prove a lower bound of the functional (1.3).
In Section 6, we exhibit a vortex-less regime and we achieve the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6.
Finally, in Appendix A, we prove a uniqueness result concerning the solution of the canonical equation without magnetic field (this is Eq. (2.1)), and in Appendix B, we discuss the difficulty behind the estimate of the energy of a configuration with vortices on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1_R$.

2. Sketch of proof

Canonical Equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$ for the case without magnetic field.
A general technique to tackle asymptotic problems, (successfully applied by Helffer & co-authors for linear problems (cf. e.g. [16]), and Lu-Pan for non-linear problems (cf. e.g. [22])), is to understand the canonical situation. So we consider the case without magnetic field, $H = 0$, and work with the particular domains,

$$N = \mathbb{R}\times\,]-\ell,\ell[,\quad S = \mathbb{R}^2\setminus N\,.$$

When $\ell(\varepsilon) = d\,\varepsilon$, this leads to the equations:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = (1-u^2)u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}\times\{\mathbb{R}\setminus[-d,d]\},\\ -\Delta u + a\,u = \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}\times\,]-d,d[\,,\\ \partial_{x_2}u(\cdot,t_\pm) = \partial_{x_2}u(\cdot,t_\mp),\quad u(\cdot,t_\pm) = u(\cdot,t_\mp),\quad t=\pm d\,, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Since Eq. (2.1) arises as a limiting equation of a critical point of (G-L), we focus on solutions in the class

$$\mathcal{C} = \{u\in H^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)\ :\ u\geq 0\}\,.$$

Using the argument of [19, Section 4], Eq. (2.1) admits in $\mathcal{C}$ a unique solution

$$\mathbb{R}^2\ni(x_1,x_2)\mapsto U(x_2)$$

given by

$$U(x_2) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\beta(a,d)\exp(\sqrt{2}\,|x_2|)-1}{\beta(a,d)\exp(\sqrt{2}\,|x_2|)+1} & \text{if } |x_2|\geq d,\\ A(a,d)\,[\exp(\sqrt{a}\,|x_2|)+\exp(-\sqrt{a}\,|x_2|)] & \text{if } |x_2|<d. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where the constants $\beta(a,d) > \exp(-\sqrt{2}\,d)$ and $A(a,d) > 0$ are determined explicitly, but the only important remark is that

$$\frac{U'(d)}{U(d)} = -\frac{U'(-d)}{U(-d)} = 2\sqrt{a}\frac{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)-1}{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)+1}\,,$$

hence the conditions of de Gennes are verified

$$\begin{pmatrix} U'(t)\\ U(t)\end{pmatrix}_{t=d} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2\sqrt{a}\,\dfrac{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)-1}{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)+1}\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} U'(t)\\ U(t)\end{pmatrix}_{t=-d}. \tag{2.3}$$

The case without magnetic field in a bounded domain.
Now we return to minimizing (1.3) when $H=0$. We prove in [19, Theorem 1.1] that (1.3) has, up to a gauge transformation, a unique minimizer $(u_\varepsilon,0)$ where $u_\varepsilon\in H^2(\Omega)$ is a real-valued function, $0<u_\varepsilon<1$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ (for ε small enough), and u_ε solves the equation

$$-\Delta u_\varepsilon=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(1-u_\varepsilon^2)u_\varepsilon\,1_S-\frac{a}{\varepsilon^2}u_\varepsilon\,1_N\,.$$

Then, by a blow-up argument, we generalize (2.3) asymptotically as $\varepsilon\to0$, see Theorem 3.2.

The case with magnetic field: A vortex-less regime.
Now we return to minimizers (ψ,A) of (1.3) when $H>0$. Following an idea of Lassoued-Mironescu [21], we introduce a normalized density

$$\varphi=\frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}\,.$$

Then, $|\varphi|\leq1$ and we are led to work with the functional (see Theorem 3.5):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)=&\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^2|(\nabla-iA)\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\\&+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}\int_S u_\varepsilon^4(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Then, following [25, 27], we construct a family of disjoint balls $(B(a_i,r_i))_i$ (see Proposition 5.2) such that $\sum_i r_i\leq|\ln\varepsilon|^{-10}$ and

$$\{x\in\overline{\Omega}\ :\ |\varphi(x)|\leq1-|\ln\varepsilon|^{-2}\}\subset\bigcup_i B(a_i,r_i)\,.$$

This permits to obtain, for a given number $\alpha\in]0,\frac12[$, a lower bound of the energy (see Theorem 5.4):

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\geq M_0(\varepsilon,H)+\sum_i\left(2\pi\alpha\,m_i(\varepsilon)|\ln\varepsilon|-2H\right)d_i-C\,H|\ln\varepsilon|^{-10}\,,\tag{2.4}$$

where $C>0$ is an explicit constant, d_i is the degree of $\varphi/|\varphi|$ on $\partial B(a_i,r_i)$,

$$m_i(\varepsilon)=\min_{x\in B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2(x)\,,$$

and

$$M_0(\varepsilon,H)=\inf_{A\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(1,A)\,.\tag{2.5}$$

By comparing (2.4) with what is existing in the literature (c.f. [26]), we suspect that the lower bound (2.4) is not optimal in the sense that α should be equal to 1. This restriction is actually due to the particular expression of $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$, where a penalization term for $|\varphi|$ is absent in the energy of N.
The infimum in (2.5) is achieved by a unique vector field $\mathcal{A}=\frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon$, where $h_\varepsilon\ :\Omega\mapsto]0,1[$ satisfies a London equation with weight (see (4.4)). Thus, we get the upper bound

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\leq M_0(\varepsilon,H).$$

When this upper bound is matched with (2.4), we deduce that all the $d_i's$ are equal to 0 provided that

$$H\leq\alpha\pi\left(\inf_i m_i(\varepsilon)\right)|\ln\varepsilon|\,.$$

If $\ell(\varepsilon)\gg\varepsilon$ and $|a_i|=R$, we have by Theorem 3.4 that

$$m_i(\varepsilon)\approx\exp\left(-\frac{2\sqrt{a}\,\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\right)\,.$$

Since we can not exclude the possibility of a vortex ball centered on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1_R$, we restrict ourselves when $\ell(\varepsilon) \gg \varepsilon$ to magnetic fields H satisfying

$$H \leq \lambda \exp\left(-\frac{2\sqrt{a}\,\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\right)|\ln\varepsilon|$$

in order to insure the absence of vortices.

Now, in the absence of vortices we get an energy estimate (see Theorem 6.1)

$$\int_\Omega \left(|(\nabla - iA)\varphi|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\,A - H\,h_\varepsilon|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_S (1-|\varphi|^2)^2 \mathrm{d}x \ll 1 \quad (\varepsilon \to 0)\,.$$

Then, we implement L^2-estimates for the equations of φ in order to deduce that

$$[\varphi]_N \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{S}^1), \quad |\varphi| \to 1, \quad n(x)\cdot(\nabla - iA)\varphi \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\partial N)\,,$$

which permits us to deduce Theorems 1.1 and 1.5, see Section 6.1.

3. Preliminary analysis of minimizers

3.1. **The case without applied magnetic field.**

This section is devoted to a summary of the main results obtained in [19] which deal with minimizers of (1.3) when the applied magnetic field $H = 0$.

We keep the notation introduced in Section 1. Upon taking $A = 0$ and $H = 0$ in (1.3), one is led to introduce the functional

$$\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(u) := \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}\int_S (1-u^2)^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{a}{\varepsilon^2}\int_N u^2\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{3.1}$$

defined for functions in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$.

We introduce

$$C_0(\varepsilon) = \inf_{u\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(u)\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The next theorem is a summary of Theorem 1.1 in [19].

Theorem 3.1. *Given $a > 0$ and $d > 0$, there exists ε_0 such that for all $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, the functional (3.1) admits in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ a minimizer $u_\varepsilon \in C^2(\overline{S}) \cup C^2(\overline{N})$ such that*

$$0 < u_\varepsilon < 1 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}.$$

Furthermore, with our choice of the domains Ω, N and S in (1.1) and (1.2), the function u_ε is radial.

If $H = 0$, minimizers of (1.3) are gauge equivalent to the state $(u_\varepsilon, 0)$.

Let us just mention why we focus only on the regime $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Notice that $u \equiv 0$ is a critical point of the functional (3.1), so we would like to exclude the possibility that this critical point is stable. To this end, we define the following eigenvalue :

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1(a,d,\varepsilon) = \inf\Bigg\{ &\int_S \left(|\nabla\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}|\phi|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_N \left(|\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{a}{\varepsilon^2}|\phi|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x \;:\; \phi \in H^1(\Omega),\ \|\phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1\Bigg\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then when $\lambda_1(a,d,\varepsilon) < 0$, the corresponding eigenfunction of $\lambda_1(a,d,\varepsilon)$ provides us with a test configuration whose energy is below that of $u \equiv 0$. On the other hand, this last condition of the sign of $\lambda_1(a,m,\varepsilon)$ is easily verified when $\varepsilon \to 0$, thanks in particular to the min-max principle.

Let us recall the notation of the *jump* across N introduced in (1.4). Using a blow-up argument and a result concerning uniqueness of critical points of the functional

(3.1) in the model case of the entire plane, we establish now Theorem 1.1 in the case when $H=0$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let u_ε be the positive minimizer of (3.1) introduced in Theorem 3.1. Then, if $\ell(\varepsilon)=d\,\varepsilon$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left\|\varepsilon\left[\frac{n(x)\cdot\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon}\right]_N-2\sqrt{a}\,\frac{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)-1}{\exp(2\sqrt{a}\,d)+1}\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0\,,\tag{3.3}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\big\|\,[u_\varepsilon]_N\big\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0\,,\tag{3.4}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left(\sup_{\theta\in[0,2\pi[}\left|u_\varepsilon\left((R\pm\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)-\widetilde{A}(a,d)\right|\right)=0\,.\tag{3.5}$$

Here, $n(x)=\dfrac{x}{|x|}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\{0\}$, and $A(a,d)>0$ is an explicit constant[2]*.*
On the other hand, if $\ell(\varepsilon)\gg\varepsilon$ (this covers the regime (1.9)), then we have,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left\|\varepsilon\left[\frac{n(x)\cdot\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon}\right]_N-2\sqrt{a}\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)}=0\,,\tag{3.6}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left(\sup_{\theta\in[0,2\pi[}\left|u_\varepsilon\left((R\pm\ell)e^{i\theta}\right)-A(a)\right|\right)=0\,,\tag{3.7}$$

where $A(a)>0$ is an explicit constant.

Proof. Let us treat the case when $\ell(\varepsilon)=d\,\varepsilon$, $d>0$. Let (r,θ) be polar coordinates, $0<r<1$, $-\pi<\theta<\pi$, and set

$$t=R-r,\quad s=R\theta\,.$$

Given $s_0\in[-R\pi,R\pi[$, we define the rescaled function,

$$\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon(s,t)=u_\varepsilon\left((R-\varepsilon t)e^{i\varepsilon(s-s_0)/R}\right)\,,\quad \frac{R-1}{\varepsilon}<t<\frac{1-R}{\varepsilon},\ -\pi\frac{R}{\varepsilon}<s-s_0<\pi\frac{R}{\varepsilon}.$$

The equation of $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon$ becomes:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}-\Delta_\varepsilon\,\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon=(1-\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^2)\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon,\quad 0<t<\frac{1-R}{\varepsilon},\ |s-s_0|<\pi\frac{R}{\varepsilon},\\[2mm] -\Delta_\varepsilon\,\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon+am\,\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon=0,\quad \frac{R-1}{\varepsilon}<t<0,\ |s-s_0|<\pi\frac{R}{\varepsilon},\\[2mm] \dfrac{\partial\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon}{\partial t}(\cdot,t_\pm)=\dfrac{\partial\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon}{\partial t}(\cdot,t_\mp),\quad \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon(\cdot,t_\pm)=\widetilde{u}(\cdot,t_\mp)\text{ for }t=\pm d\,,\end{array}\right.$$

where

$$\Delta_\varepsilon=\left(1-\varepsilon\frac{t}{R}\right)^{-2}\partial_s^2+\partial_t^2-\frac{\varepsilon}{(R-\varepsilon t)}\partial_t.$$

Now, by elliptic estimates, the function $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon$ converges to a function u in $W^{2,\infty}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Furthermore, u solves (2.1) in $\mathcal{C}$, and by [19, Lemma 5.2], there exist constants $k_0,c_0>0$ such that $u(0,k_0)>c_0$. Thus, we conclude by Theorem A.1 that $u(s,t)=U(t)$, where U is given in (2.3), and therefore, by coming back to the initial scale,

$$\forall\,k\in\{0,1,2\},\quad \lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\varepsilon^k\left\|u_\varepsilon(s,t)-U\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{W^{k,\infty}(\{|s-s_0|\leq\pi R\varepsilon,\ |t|\leq(1-R)\varepsilon\})}=0,$$

and the convergence is uniform with repect to $s_0\in[-\pi R,\pi R[$. This yields (3.3)-(3.5).

---

[2] The expression of $\widetilde{A}(a,d)$ is given explicitly in the Appendix.

The statements concerning the case when $\ell(\varepsilon) \gg \varepsilon$ follows from [19, (5.20)]. $\square$

We shall need the following remarkable properties of u_ε, that distinguish the different regimes considered in this paper.

Lemma 3.3. *With the notations and hypotheses of Theorem 3.2, if* $\ell = d\,\varepsilon$, *there exists an explicit constant* $c(a,d) > 0$ *such that*

$$u_\varepsilon(x) > c(a,d), \quad \forall\, x \in \overline{\Omega}\,.$$

For the case when $\ell(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (1.9), the asymptotic behavior of u_ε becomes completely different in the sense that it is close to 0 inside N.
In order to be precise we introduce the function :

$$V(t) = \frac{\beta\exp(\sqrt{2}\,t) - 1}{\beta\exp(\sqrt{2}\,t) + 1} \quad (t \geq 0), \quad V(t) = A\,\exp(\sqrt{a}\,t) \quad (t < 0), \tag{3.8}$$

together with the 'signed distance' to the boundary of S,

$$t_S(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial S) \quad (x \in S), \quad t_S(x) = -\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial S) \quad (x \in D(0,1) \setminus S). \tag{3.9}$$

Here the constants β and A are given by :

$$\beta = \frac{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{a+2}}{\sqrt{a}}, \quad A = \frac{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{a+2} - \sqrt{a}}{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{a+2} + \sqrt{a}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that* $\ell(\varepsilon)$ *satisfies (1.9). Then, we have*

$$\left\| u_\varepsilon - V\left(\frac{t_S(x)}{\varepsilon}\right)\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = o(1) \quad (\varepsilon \to 0), \tag{3.11}$$

where the functions t_S *and* V *have been introduced in (3.8)-(3.9).*
Moreover, there exist a positive constant ε_0 *and a function* $]0,1] \ni \varepsilon \mapsto g(\varepsilon) \in]0,1[$ *such that* $g(\varepsilon) \ll 1$ *and for all* $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$, *one has the estimate*

$$(A - g(\varepsilon))\exp\left(\frac{\sqrt{a}\,t_S(x)}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq u_\varepsilon(x) \leq (A + g(\varepsilon))\exp\left(\frac{\sqrt{a}\,t_S(x)}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \forall\, x \in \overline{N}. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. The asymptotic behavior in (3.11) has been obtained in [19]. We have only to prove the improved estimate in N, i.e. (3.12).
Let us show how one can obtain the lower bound. Let us introduce the function :

$$v_\varepsilon(x) = C\exp\left(\frac{\delta\, t_S(x)}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

where C and δ are positive constants to be specified later.
Let us recall that by definition, the function t_S is written as

$$t_S(x) = \begin{cases} R - \ell(\varepsilon) - |x| & \text{if } R - \ell(\varepsilon) \leq |x| \leq R, \\ |x| - R - \ell(\varepsilon) & \text{if } R < |x| \leq R + \ell(\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

where the constant $R \in]0,1[$ has been introduced for defining S and N, see (1.1) and (1.2).
Consequently, the function t_S is smooth in each of the following two annuli of N:

$$N_- = \{x \in N \ : \ R - \ell(\varepsilon) < |x| < R\}, \quad N_+ = \{x \in N \ : \ R < |x| < R + \ell(\varepsilon)\}.$$

One then checks easily that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon) + \frac{a}{\varepsilon^2}(u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon) &= \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon^2}\left[1 - \frac{a}{\delta^2} \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}|x|^{-1}\right] v_\varepsilon \\ &\geq \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon^2}\left[1 - \frac{a}{\delta^2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta(R - \ell(\varepsilon))}\right] v_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } N_\pm. \end{aligned}$$

It is a result of the asymptotic formula (3.11) that there exist a constant ε_0 and a function $]0,\varepsilon_0]\ni\varepsilon\mapsto f(\varepsilon)\in]0,1[$ such that $f(\varepsilon)\ll 1$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$ and

$$\left|u_{\varepsilon|_{\partial N}}-A\right|\leq f(\varepsilon),\quad \varepsilon\in]0,\varepsilon_0].$$

Therefore, gathering all the above remarks, we get for

$$\delta=\sqrt{a+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4(R-\ell(\varepsilon))^2}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2(R-\ell(\varepsilon))}}\,,\quad C=A-2f(\varepsilon)$$

and when $\varepsilon\in]0,\varepsilon_0]$,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} -\Delta(u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon)+\dfrac{a}{\varepsilon^2}(u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon)\geq 0 & \text{in } N_\pm\\ u_\varepsilon(x)-v_\varepsilon(x)>0 & \text{on } \partial N\,. \end{array}\right. \tag{3.13}$$

Two cases may occur regarding the gradient of u_ε on the circle $|x|=R$, either $u_\varepsilon'(R)\leq 0$ or $u_\varepsilon'(R)>0$.
If $u_\varepsilon'(R)\leq 0$, then we get in addition to (3.13)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu_{N_+}}(u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon)>0\quad\text{on } (\partial N_+)\cap N.$$

Here, we recall that $\nu_{N_\pm}$ denote the unit outward normal vectors of the boundaries of $N_\pm$.
Therefore, the application of the strong maximum principle yields that

$$u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon\geq 0\quad\text{in}\quad\overline{N_+}\,.$$

This last lower bound when combined with (3.13) yields

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} -\Delta(u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon)+\dfrac{a}{\varepsilon^2}(u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon)\geq 0 & \text{in } N_-\\ u_\varepsilon(x)-v_\varepsilon(x)>0 & \text{on } \partial N_-\,. \end{array}\right.$$

Hence by the strong maximum principle, $u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon\geq 0$ in $\overline{N_-}$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$u_\varepsilon-v_\varepsilon\geq 0\quad\text{in}\,\overline{N}\,,$$

which is nothing but the lower bound we wish to prove for the function u_ε. The same argument holds when $u_\varepsilon'(R)>0$, but by changing the roles of N_+ and N_-.
The proof of the upper bound follows the same lines above, so we omit the details.□

3.2. **The case with magnetic field.** This section is devoted to a preliminary analysis of the minimizers of (1.3) when $H\neq 0$. The main point that we shall show is how to extract the singular term $C_0(\varepsilon)$ (cf. (3.2)) from the energy of a minimizer.

Notice that the existence of minimizers is standard starting from a minimizing sequence (cf. e.g. [15]). A standard choice of gauge permits one to assume that the magnetic potential satisfies

$$\operatorname{div} A=0\quad\text{in }\Omega,\quad \nu\cdot A=0\quad\text{on }\partial\Omega, \tag{3.14}$$

where ν is the outward unit normal vector of $\partial\Omega$.
With this choice of gauge, one is able to prove (when the boundaries of Ω and N are smooth) that a minimizer (ψ,A) is in $C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{C})\times C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^2)$. One has also the following regularity (cf. [19, Appendix A]),

$$\psi\in C^2(\overline{S};\mathbb{C})\cup C^2(\overline{N};\mathbb{C}),\quad A\in C^2(\overline{S};\mathbb{R}^2)\cup C^2(\overline{N};\mathbb{R}^2).$$

The next lemma is inspired from the work of Lassoued-Mironescu (cf. [21]).

Lemma 3.5. *Let (ψ, A) be a minimizer of (1.3). Then $0 \leq |\psi| \leq u_\varepsilon$ in Ω, where u_ε is the positive minimizer of (3.1).*
Moreover, putting $\varphi = \frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$, then the energy functional (1.3) splits in the form :

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi, A) = C_0(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A), \tag{3.15}$$

where $C_0(\varepsilon)$ has been introduced in (3.2) and the new functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$ is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) = &\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^2 |(\nabla - iA)\varphi|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}\int_S u_\varepsilon^4 (1-|\varphi|^2)^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega |\mathrm{curl}\, A - H|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Proof.
The equality (3.16) results from a direct but some how long calculation, which permits to deduce in particular that φ is a solution of the equation

$$-(\nabla - iA)u_\varepsilon^2(\nabla - iA)\varphi = 1_S \frac{u_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\varphi\,.$$

Proof of $|\psi| \leq u_\varepsilon$.
It is sufficient to prove that $|\varphi| \leq 1$. We shall invoke an energy argument which we take from [11].
Let us introduce the set

$$\Omega_+ = \{x \in \overline{\Omega} \ :\ |\varphi(x)| > 1\}\,,$$

together with the functions (defined in Ω_+) :

$$f = \frac{\varphi}{|\varphi|}\,, \quad \widetilde{\varphi} = [\,|\varphi| - 1]_+ f\,.$$

Then, it results from a direct calculation together with the weak-formulation of the equation satisfied by φ that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \ = \ &\int_{\Omega_+} \left(|\nabla|\varphi|\,|^2 + (|\varphi|-1)|\varphi|\,|(\nabla - iA)f|^2\right) u_\varepsilon^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_{\Omega_+\cap S} \left(1+|\varphi|)(1-|\varphi|)^2|\varphi|\right) u_\varepsilon^4 \,\mathrm{d}x\,.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, this yields that $\Omega_+ \subset N$ and that $|\nabla|\varphi|\,| \equiv 0$ in Ω_+. Hence, $|\varphi|$ is constant in each connected component of Ω_+, which shows that $|\varphi| \equiv 1$ in Ω_+. This contradicts the definition of Ω_+ unless $\Omega_+ = \emptyset$. □

The estimate of the next lemma is very useful for exhibiting a vortex-less regime for minimizers of (1.3).

Lemma 3.6. *Let (ψ, A) be a minimizer of (1.3). There exist constants $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1]$ such that, if the applied magnetic field satisfies $H \ll \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, then we have*

$$|(\nabla - iA)\psi| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]\,.$$

Proof. The proof is essentially due to Béthuel-Rivière [8], but we include the main steps for the reader's convenience.
Since $|(\nabla - iA)\psi|$ is a gauge invariant quantity, we assume that we are in the Coulomb gauge (3.14).
Let us assume that the conclusion of the lemma were false. Then there exists a subsequence, denoted again $\{\varepsilon\}$ and points $(x_\varepsilon) \in \Omega$ such that

$$\varepsilon|(\nabla - iA)\psi(x_\varepsilon)| \to \infty\,. \tag{3.17}$$

We define the rescaled functions

$$v_\varepsilon(x)=\psi(x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon x),\quad B_\varepsilon(x)=\varepsilon A(x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon x)\,,$$

together with the rescaled domain

$$\Omega_\varepsilon=(\Omega-x_\varepsilon)/\varepsilon\,.$$

Notice that $(v_\varepsilon,B_\varepsilon)$ satisfies the equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl}-\Delta v_\varepsilon+2iB_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla&=&\left[(1-|v_\varepsilon|^2)\,1_S-a\,1_N+|B_\varepsilon|^2\right]v_\varepsilon\quad\text{in }\Omega_\varepsilon,\\ -\Delta B_\varepsilon&=&\varepsilon^2\,(iv_\varepsilon\,,\,\nabla v_\varepsilon-iB_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon)\quad\text{in }\Omega_\varepsilon,\\ \operatorname{curl}B_\varepsilon&=&\varepsilon^2H^2\quad\text{on }\partial\Omega_\varepsilon,\\ n\cdot\nabla v_\varepsilon&=&0\quad\text{on }\partial\Omega_\varepsilon\,.\end{array}\right.$$

Notice that v_ε is a weak solution in Ω of the first equation above because of the transmission conditions

$$\mathcal{T}^{\rm int}_{\partial N}(n\cdot\nabla v_\varepsilon)=\mathcal{T}^{\rm ext}_{\partial N}(n\cdot\nabla v_\varepsilon),$$

where

$$\mathcal{T}^{\rm int}_{\partial N}\ :\ H^1(N)\mapsto L^2(\partial N),\quad \mathcal{T}^{\rm int}_{\partial N}\ :\ H^1(\Omega\setminus\overline{N})\mapsto L^2(\partial N),$$

are the 'interior' and 'exterior' trace operators.

With the choice of gauge in (3.14), we get by Poincaré's Lemma that $\|A\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\leq C\|\operatorname{curl}A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Then, by L^2 elliptic estimates and the assumption $H\ll\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\|A_\varepsilon\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\leq C\|\operatorname{curl}A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ll\frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

Hence, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have in the new scale,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\|B_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon)}=0\,.$$

Now, by Lemma 3.5, $|v_\varepsilon|\leq u_\varepsilon\leq1$, hence, the right hand side of the equation of v_ε becomes bounded. Therefore,

$$\|\Delta v_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B_R)}\leq C_R+2\|B_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon)}\times\|\nabla v_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B_R)},\quad\forall\,p>2\,,$$

where B_R is any fixed ball of radius R.

By elliptic regularity theory, v_ε becomes bounded in $W^{2,p}(B_R)$ for all $p>2$, hence, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, in $C^{1,\alpha}(B_R)$ for any $\alpha\in]0,1[$. Since $C^{1,\alpha}(B_R)$ is compactly embedded in $C^1(B_R)$, we get by a diagonal argument the existence of a function $v\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, upon extraction of a subsequence, v_ε converges to v locally in C^1.

Now, we know from the equation of B_ε that ΔB_ε is locally bounded in L^∞. So again, by elliptic estimates, and since $\|B_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty}\to0$ as $\varepsilon\to0$, we get upon extraction of a subsequence that B_ε converges to 0 locally in C^1.

Therefore, we get, by returning to the initial scale,

$$\varepsilon|(\nabla-iA)\psi(x_\varepsilon)|=|(\nabla-iB_\varepsilon)v_\varepsilon(0)|$$

is convergent, hence contradicting (3.17). □

Now, Lemma 3.6 permits to conclude the following result.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that (ψ,A) is a minimizer of (1.3) and let $\varphi=\frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$. There exists a constant $\mu_0>0$ such that if*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_S(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\,{\rm d}x\leq\mu_0\,,$$

then $|\varphi|\geq\frac12$ in S.

Proof. Lemma 3.6 and the diamagnetic inequality together yield that

$$|\nabla|\psi|\,| \leq |(\nabla - iA)\psi| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{in } \Omega\,.$$

Now, since

$$|\nabla u_\varepsilon| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}$$

we deduce that

$$|\nabla|\varphi|\,| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } \overline{S}\,.$$

Thus, the result of the lemma becomes a consequence of [7, Theorem III.3]. □

4. Analysis of the Meissner state

Let us recall the definition of u_ε and $C_0(\varepsilon)$ in Theorem 3.1 and (3.2) respectively. This section is devoted to the analysis of the following variational problem :

$$M_0(\varepsilon, H) = \min_{A\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)} \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(u_\varepsilon, A)\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Since the function u_ε is real-valued, one gets, for any vector field A, the following decomposition :

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(u_\varepsilon, A) = C_0(\varepsilon) + \int_\Omega \left(|Au_\varepsilon|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\, A - H|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Putting further

$$A = H\,\mathcal{A},$$

$$J_0(\varepsilon) = \inf_{\mathcal{A}\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)} \left[\int_\Omega \left(|\mathcal{A}\,u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\,\mathcal{A} - 1|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\right], \tag{4.2}$$

we get that

$$M_0(\varepsilon, H) = \inf_{A\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)} \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(u_\varepsilon, A) = C_0(\varepsilon) + H^2 J_0(\varepsilon),$$

and we are reduced to the analysis of the variational problem (4.2).
Starting from a minimizing sequence (cf. [26]), it is standard to prove that a minimizer A_ε of (4.2) exists and satisfies the Coulomb gauge condition:

$$\mathrm{div}\, A_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad n \cdot A_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

where n is the unit outward normal vector of the boundary of Ω.
Notice also that A_ε satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equations :

$$\nabla^\perp \mathrm{curl}\, A_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon^2\, A_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \mathrm{curl}\, A_\varepsilon = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{4.3}$$

Here $\nabla^\perp = (-\partial_{x_2}, \partial_{x_1})$ is the *Hodge gradient.*
Putting $h_\varepsilon = \mathrm{curl}\, A_\varepsilon$, we get from the first equation in (4.3) that $A_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon$. We get also that h_ε satisfies the equation:

$$-\,\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla h_\varepsilon\right) + h_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad h_\varepsilon = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.1. *The function h_ε satisfies $0 < h_\varepsilon < 1$ in Ω, and it is the only function solving (4.4).*
Moreover, there exist constants $c_0, \varepsilon_0 \in]0,1[$ such that,

$$c_0 \leq \|h_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < 1, \quad \forall\, \varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The property that $0 < h_\varepsilon < 1$ and the uniqueness of h_ε are direct applications of the Strong Maximum Principle.
Let us now prove (4.5). Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence converging to 0, still denoted by ε, such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|h_\varepsilon - 1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Let us take a compact subset $K \subset S$ (independent of ε). Due to the asymptotic behaviour of u_ε (it remains exponentially close to 1 in K, see Theorem 3.1 and [19, Proposition 5.1]), it results from (4.4) that h_ε is bounded in the C^2-norm of K. Thus, one can extract a subsequence of h_ε, still denoted by h_ε, that converges to a function $h \in C^2(K)$. The function h satisfies the limiting equation,

$$-\Delta h + h = 0 \quad \text{in } K.$$

Coming back to (4.6), we get that $h \equiv 1$ in K, hence not a solution of the limiting equation. Therefore, the assertion in (4.5) holds. □

The next results concern the case of our particular domains in (1.1) and (1.2).

Lemma 4.2. *With the assumptions (1.1) and (1.2), the function* h_ε *is radial, i.e.* $h_\varepsilon(x) = \widetilde{h}_\varepsilon(|x|)$, *with* $\widetilde{h}_\varepsilon$ *being an increasing function.*

Proof. That h_ε is radial follows by the uniqueness of the solution of (4.4) and by the fact that u_ε is also radial.
The solution h_ε being radial, i.e.

$$h_\varepsilon(x) = \widetilde{h}_\varepsilon(|x|), \quad \forall\, x \in \Omega,$$

let us show that the function $\widetilde{h}_\varepsilon$ is increasing. For simplicity of notation, we shall remove the tilde and write h_ε for $\widetilde{h}_\varepsilon$. Notice that h_ε satisfies the differential equation :

$$\begin{cases} -h_\varepsilon''(r) - \dfrac{1}{r}h_\varepsilon'(r) + 2\dfrac{u_\varepsilon'(r)}{u_\varepsilon(r)}\, h_\varepsilon'(r) + u_\varepsilon^2(r)\, h_\varepsilon(r) = 0, \quad 0 < r < 1,\\ h_\varepsilon'(0) = 0, \quad h_\varepsilon(1) = 1. \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

Let us calculate $h_\varepsilon''(0)$. Since $h_\varepsilon'(0) = 0$, we have $h_\varepsilon''(0) = \lim_{r\to 0} \dfrac{h_\varepsilon'(r)}{r}$. Substituting in (4.7), we get that

$$h_\varepsilon''(0) = \frac{1}{2}u_\varepsilon^2(0)\, h_\varepsilon(0) > 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Let us introduce the even extension of h_ε, namely the function

$$f_\varepsilon(r) = \begin{cases} h_\varepsilon(r) & (r > 0),\\ h_\varepsilon(-r) & (r < 0). \end{cases}$$

Then f_ε satisfies the equation,

$$-f_\varepsilon''(r) - \frac{1}{|r|}f_\varepsilon'(r) + 2\frac{\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon'(r)}{\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon(r)}\, f_\varepsilon'(r) + \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^2(r)\, f_\varepsilon(r) = 0, \quad r \in]-r_2, r_2[\setminus\{0\}, \tag{4.9}$$

and it attains a local minimum at 0. We emphasize also here that $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon$ denotes the even extension of u_ε.
If $r_0 \in]-1,1[$ (with $r_0 \neq 0$) is a critical point of f_ε, then it follows from (4.9) that :

$$f_\varepsilon''(r_0) = \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon^2(r_0)\, f_\varepsilon(r_0) > 0.$$

If $r_0 = 0$, the conclusion $f_\varepsilon''(0) > 0$ still holds, thanks to (4.8).
Now these observations lead to the conclusion that f_ε attains its minimum at a unique point, and that this point is the only critical point for f_ε. As we know that $f_\varepsilon'(0) = 0$, we get that f_ε attains its minimum at 0 and that it is increasing in $[0,1[$.

This achieves the proof of the lemma. □

The next lemma plays a distinguished role in the control of the minimizing energy of 'vortex balls'.

Lemma 4.3. *There exist constants* $C > 0$ *and* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2} \nabla h_\varepsilon \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq 1, \quad \forall\, \varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]. \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. Notice that by Lemma 4.2, h_ε is radial. Then the equation for h_ε can be written in the form:

$$-\left(\frac{h_\varepsilon'}{u_\varepsilon^2}\right)'(r) - \frac{1}{r}\frac{h_\varepsilon'}{u_\varepsilon^2}(r) + h_\varepsilon(r) = 0, \quad \forall\, r \in]0,1[.$$

Integrating this equation between 0 and $r \in]0,1[$ and using the fact that h_ε is increasing, $h_\varepsilon' \geq 0$, we obtain:

$$\left(\frac{h_\varepsilon'}{u_\varepsilon^2}\right)(r) \leq \int_0^r h_\varepsilon(\widetilde{r})\,\mathrm{d}\widetilde{r} \leq r\|h_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty([0,1])} \leq 1,$$

which is the result of the lemma. □

5. Lower bound of the energy

5.1. **Construction of vortex-balls.** We borrow some notation used in [26]. For a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we denote by $r(U)$ the *radius* of U, that is the infimum over all finite coverings of U by open balls $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k$ of the sum $r_1 + r_2 + \cdots + r_k$. The important property is that:

$$r(U) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^1(\partial U),$$

where $\mathcal{H}^1$ is the one-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

From now on, we shall always work under the following hypothesis:

$$\text{(H)} \quad \exists\, c > 0,\ \forall\, \varepsilon \in]0,1], \quad \ell(\varepsilon) \leq c \ln|\ln\varepsilon|, \quad H \leq c\, m_\varepsilon\, |\ln\varepsilon|\,,$$

where

$$m_\varepsilon = \inf_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} u_\varepsilon^2(x)\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Notice that when $\ell(\varepsilon) = d\,\varepsilon$, m_ε and m_ε^{-1} are bounded. When $\ell(\varepsilon) \gg \varepsilon$, we have by Theorem 3.4,

$$m_\varepsilon = A(a)\exp\left(-\frac{2\sqrt{a}\,\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad (\varepsilon \to 0),$$

where $A(a) > 0$ is an explicit constant.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* (ψ, A) *be a minimizer of (1.3) and* $\varphi = \dfrac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$. *Then, under the hypotheses* (H) *above, there exist constants* $C > 0$ *and* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that, for all*

$$\delta \in \left]\, (|\ln\varepsilon| + |\ln m_\varepsilon|)\sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon_0}}\,, 1 \right[\quad \text{and } \varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0],$$

we have

$$r\left(\{x \in \overline{\Omega}\ :\ |\varphi(x)| \leq 1 - \delta\}\right) \leq C\,\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln\varepsilon|^2}{\delta^2}\,. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. We have the following decomposition of the energy,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi,A)=C_0(\varepsilon)+\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A),$$

where the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)$ has been introduced in (3.16).
Using $\left(u_\varepsilon,\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon\right)$ as a test configuration for the functional (1.3), we get

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\psi,A)\leq \widetilde{c}H^2. \tag{5.3}$$

We infer from (5.3),

$$\int_\Omega |(\nabla-iA)\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}\int_S(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\,\mathrm{d}x\leq 2\,\widehat{c}\,m_\varepsilon^{-2}H^2\,,$$

where m_ε is introduced in (5.1).
By Lemma 3.5, $|\varphi|\leq 1$, hence

$$\int_N(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\,\mathrm{d}x\leq 2|N|\leq 4\pi\ell(\varepsilon)\leq C\,\varepsilon|\ln m_\varepsilon|\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Now, by (5.4) and the diamagnetic inequality, $|(\nabla-iA)\varphi|\geq|\nabla|\varphi|\,|$, we deduce

$$\int_\Omega|\nabla|\varphi|\,|^2\,\mathrm{d}x+\frac{1}{2\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}\int_\Omega(1-|\varphi|^2)^2\,\mathrm{d}x\leq M\,, \tag{5.5}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}=\sqrt{\varepsilon}\,,\quad M=2\,\widetilde{c}\left(m_\varepsilon^{-2}H^2+|\ln m_\varepsilon|\right).$$

Since φ is a H^2-function, then it can be approximated in the L^∞-norm by means of smooth functions. This permits us to conclude (5.2) from Proposition C.1. □

The next proposition provides us, as in [26], with the construction of suitable 'vortex-balls'.

Proposition 5.2. *Let (ψ,A) be a minimizer of (1.3) and $\varphi=\dfrac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$. Then, under the hypotheses* (H), *for each $p\in]1,2[$, $\alpha\in]0,1/2[$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, there exist constants $C>0$, $\gamma\in]0,1/2[$, and for each $\varepsilon^\alpha\ll\eta\ll1$, there exists a family of disjoint balls $\{B((a_i,r_i)\}_i$ satisfying the following properties:*

1. $w=\{x\in\overline{\Omega}\;:\;|\varphi(x)|\leq 1-|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}\}\subset\cup_iB(a_i,r_i)$.
2. $\sum_i r_i\leq\eta$.
3. *Letting d_i be the degree of the function $\varphi/|\varphi|$ restricted to $\partial B(a_i,r_i)$ if $B(a_i,r_i)\subset\Omega$ and $d_i=0$ otherwise, then we have:*

$$\int_{B(a_i,r_i)\setminus\omega}u_\varepsilon^2|(\nabla-iA)\varphi|^2\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{B(a_i,r_i)}|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\geq 2\pi|d_i|\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2\right)\left(\ln\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon^\alpha}-C|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}\right). \tag{5.6}$$

4. $\left\|2\pi\sum_i d_i\delta_{a_i}-\mathrm{curl}\big(A+(i\varphi,\nabla_A\varphi)\big)\right\|_{W_0^{-1,p}(\Omega)}\leq\max(|\ln\varepsilon|^{2-2n},\eta^\gamma)$.

Proof. Let us take $\delta=|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}$ in the statement of Lemma 5.1. We emphasize that under the hypothesis (H), our choice of δ verifies the hypothesis of Lemma 5.1, namely, $\delta\in\left](|\ln\varepsilon|+|\ln m_\varepsilon|)\sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon_0}}\,,1\right[$.
Points (1) and (2) of Proposition 5.2 are now direct consequences of Lemma 5.1 and the first point of Proposition C.2.
Let us prove now Point (3). By the estimate on $r(w)$, we get for a given $\alpha\in]0,\frac{1}{2}[$,

$r(w) < \varepsilon^\alpha$ provided that ε is sufficiently small.
Now, notice that in $B(a_i, r_i) \setminus w$,

$$|(\nabla - iA)\varphi|^2 \geq |\varphi|^2 \left|(\nabla - iA)\frac{\varphi}{|\varphi|}\right|^2, \quad \frac{|\varphi|^2 - 1}{|\varphi|^2} \geq -2|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}.$$

Hence, we get the desired conclusion by applying the third point of Proposition C.2 to the function $\varphi/|\varphi|$.
Notice that the function φ and the balls $B(a_i, r_i)$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition C.3 with $M = \mathcal{O}(|\ln\varepsilon|^2)$. The application of this proposition yields the conclusion in the last point of Proposition 5.2. $\square$

Remark 5.3. *When performing the previous argument with* $\delta = \varepsilon^\beta$ *and* $\beta \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$ *sufficiently small, we get improved remainders in (3)-(4) of Proposition 5.2, a power of* ε*, but valid for larger values of* η*. This permits to treat the case when the thickness* $\ell(\varepsilon) \leq c\,\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|$ *and* $c \in]0, 1[$ *is sufficiently small.*

We follow the usual terminology and call the balls constructed in Proposition 5.2 'vortex-balls'.

We conclude with the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let* (ψ, A) *be a minimizer of (1.3) and* $\varphi = \dfrac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$*. Then, under the hypothesis* (H)*, for each* $\alpha \in]0, 1/2[$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, there exist a constant* $C > 0$ *and a family of disjoint balls* $\{B((a_i, r_i)\}_i$ *such that :*

1. $\displaystyle\sum_i r_i \leq C\varepsilon^{\alpha'}$, $(\alpha' \in]0, \frac{1}{2} - \alpha[)$*;*
2. $|\varphi| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ *on* $\Omega \setminus \cup_i B(a_i, r_i)$*.*
3. *Letting* d_i *be the degree of the function* $\varphi/|\varphi|$ *restricted to* $\partial B(a_i, r_i)$ *if* $B(a_i, r_i) \subset \Omega$ *and* $d_i = 0$ *otherwise, then we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) \geq\ & H^2 J_0(\varepsilon) \\ & + 2\pi \sum_{d_i \geq 0} \left[\alpha\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)} u_\varepsilon^2\right)|\ln\varepsilon| - 2H\right] d_i - CH|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}\,;\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

4. $\sum_i |d_i| \leq C\,m_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|\,.$

Proof. Applying Proposition 5.2 with $\eta = \varepsilon^{\alpha'}$ and with α replaced by $\beta \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$ to be chosen sufficiently close to $\frac{1}{2}$, we get a family of balls satisfying in particular the first two assertions of the theorem.

Total degree.
We start by proving an upper bound on the total degree $\sum_i |d_i|$. The starting point is by noticing that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) \leq c\,H^2.$$

Then, by applying Point (3) of Proposition 5.2 with $\eta = \varepsilon^{\alpha'}$, we deduce the existence of a constant $\widetilde{c} > 0$ such that

$$2\pi\,m_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon| \sum_i |d_i| \leq \widetilde{c}\,H^2,$$

hence Point (4) of the theorem is proved.

A rough lower bound of the energy.
We put

$$\widetilde{\Omega}=\Omega\Big\backslash\bigcup_{B(a_i,r_i)\subset\Omega}B(a_i,r_i),$$

$$j=(i\varphi,\nabla_A\varphi)\,,\quad j'=j-\frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon,\quad A'=A-\frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon.$$

Since $|\varphi|\leq 1$, then

$$|j|\leq|\varphi|\,|\nabla_A\varphi|\leq|\nabla_A\varphi|,$$

and consequently, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A,\widetilde{\Omega})\geq\int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}\left(u_\varepsilon^2|j|^2+|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Now a direct calculation yields,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A,\widetilde{\Omega})\geq&H^2J_0(\varepsilon,\widetilde{\Omega})+2H\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)\big[\mathrm{curl}(A'+j')\big]\,\mathrm{d}x\\&-2H\int_{\cup_iB(a_i,r_i)}\big[(h_\varepsilon-1)\,\mathrm{curl}\,A'-j'\cdot\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon\big]\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_0(\varepsilon,\widetilde{\Omega})=\int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2+|h_\varepsilon-1|^2\right)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Using Lemma 4.3 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is easy to prove that

$$\left|\int_{\cup_iB(a_i,r_i)}\big[(h_\varepsilon-1)\,\mathrm{curl}\,A'-j'\cdot\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon\big]\,\mathrm{d}x\right|\leq C\,H\sum_i r_i,$$

and

$$\left|J_0(\varepsilon)-J_0(\varepsilon,\widetilde{\Omega})\right|\leq C\sum_i r_i.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A,\widetilde{\Omega})\geq H^2J_0(\varepsilon)+2H\int_\Omega(h_\varepsilon-1)\big[\mathrm{curl}(A'+j')\big]\,\mathrm{d}x-CH^2\sum_i r_i.\tag{5.8}$$

Since $\mathrm{curl}(A'+j')=\mathrm{curl}\,(A+(i\varphi,\nabla_A\varphi))$, then by Point (4) in Proposition 5.2, we rewrite the above lower bound in the form

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A,\widetilde{\Omega})\geq H^2J_0(\varepsilon)+4\pi H\sum_i d_i(h_\varepsilon-1)(a_i)-CH|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}.\tag{5.9}$$

We have also by Point (3) of Proposition 5.2, $\forall\alpha\in]0,\frac{1}{2}[$ and when ε is sufficiently small,

$$\sum_i\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}\left(\varphi,A,B(a_i,r_i)\right)\geq 2\pi\alpha\sum_i|d_i|\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2\right)|\ln\varepsilon|.\tag{5.10}$$

Therefore, we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi,A)\quad\geq\quad&H^2J_0(\varepsilon)+2\pi\alpha\,|\ln\varepsilon|\sum_i|d_i|\left(\min_{B(a_i,r_i)}u_\varepsilon^2\right)\\&+4\pi H\sum_i d_i(h_\varepsilon-1)(a_i)-CH|\ln\varepsilon|^{-n}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.11}$$

Since $0<h_\varepsilon<1$, the above lower bound is sufficient to deduce (5.7). □

6. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

6.1. **A vortex-less regime.** Let us recall the definition of the constant m_ε introduced in (5.1). We recall also that (ψ, A) always denotes a minimizer of (1.3) and that $\varphi = \frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$.

The aim of this subsection is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *There exists a constant* $\lambda > 0$ *such that if* $\ell \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon \ln|\ln\varepsilon|)$ *and if the magnetic field satisfies*

$$H \leq \lambda m_\varepsilon |\ln\varepsilon|\,,$$

then

$$|\varphi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{in } \overline{S}\,,$$

and we have the energy estimate as $\varepsilon \to 0$

$$\int_\Omega \big(|(\nabla - iA')\varphi|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\, A - H\, h_\varepsilon|^2\big)\, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_S (1-|\varphi|^2)^2\, \mathrm{d}x \ll m_\varepsilon^4\,.$$

Here

$$A' = A - \frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon$$

and h_ε *is the function introduced in (4.4).*

One essential step towards the proof of Theorem 6.1 is a further useful splitting of the energy due to Béthuel-Rivière (cf. [8]).

Lemma 6.2. *Consider* $(u, A) \in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C}) \times H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ *and define*

$$A' = A - \frac{H}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon,$$

where u_ε *and* h_ε *are introduced in Theorem 3.1 and (4.4) respectively. Then we have the decomposition of the energy,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(u,A) =& H^2 J_0(\varepsilon) + \int_\Omega \big(u_\varepsilon^2 |(\nabla - iA')u|^2 + |\mathrm{curl}\, A'|^2\big)\, \mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_S u_\varepsilon^4 (1-|u|^2)^2 \mathrm{d}x + 2H\int_\Omega (h_\varepsilon - 1)\Big[\mathrm{curl}\big(A' + (iu, \nabla_{A'}u)\big)\Big]\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ H^2 \int_\Omega \frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\big(|u|^2 - 1\big)\,|\nabla h_\varepsilon|^2\, \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Here, the functional $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}$ *and the energy* $J_0(\varepsilon)$ *are introduced in (3.16) and (4.2) respectively.*

Proof of Theorem 6.1.
Existence of λ .
Let us choose $\lambda > 0$ in such a way that when the magnetic field satisfies

$$H \leq \lambda m_\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| \,,$$

all the degrees d_i given by Theorem 5.4 are equal to zero, so that the energy of a minimizer becomes close to that of the Meissner state.
Matching the lower bound (5.7) with the upper bound

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) \leq H^2 J_0(\varepsilon) \,, \tag{6.1}$$

we obtain,

$$\sum_{d_i>0} [\alpha\, m_\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| - 2H]\, d_i + CH \sum_{d_i<0} |d_i| - CH|\ln \varepsilon|^{-n} \leq 0 \,.$$

By our choice of H and $\ell(\varepsilon)$, we get that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{d_i>0} [\alpha\, m_\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| - 2H]\, d_i + CH \sum_{d_i<0} |d_i| \leq |\ln \varepsilon|^{-n}.$$

Now we get by choosing $\lambda < 2\alpha$ that, for all $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$,

$$0 \leq H \min\Big(\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} - 2, C\Big) \sum_i |d_i| \leq |\ln \varepsilon|^{-n}.$$

Therefore, for all i, $d_i = 0$ and there does not exist vortices.
Moreover, the lower bound (5.7) becomes when $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,H}(\varphi, A) \geq H^2 J_0(\varepsilon) - C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-n}, \tag{6.2}$$

hence when combined with the upper bound (6.1) together with the energy expansion of Lemma 6.2 and Item (4) of Proposition 5.2, we are able to deduce the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1.

Proof of $|\varphi| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.
Now, as we have the energy estimate, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_S (1 - |\varphi|^2)\, \mathrm{d}x \ll 1 \quad (\varepsilon \to 0),$$

where we have also used that, in $\overline{S}$, $u_\varepsilon \geq c_1$ for some explicit constant $c_1 > 0$. Therefore, we infer from Lemma 3.7 that $|\varphi| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in $\overline{S}$. □

It results from Theorem 6.1 a uniform estimate of $|A'|$.

Corollary 6.3. *With the notations and hypothesis of Theorem 6.1, and if the magnetic field satisfies*

$$H \leq \lambda m_\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| \,,$$

then we have as $\varepsilon \to 0$,

$$\|A'\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon^2 \,.$$

Proof. Notice that since u_ε and h_ε are radial, then

$$\nabla u_\varepsilon(x) = n(x) u'_\varepsilon(|x|), \quad \nabla h_\varepsilon(x) = n(x) h'_\varepsilon(|x|),$$

where $n(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$.
Therefore, the vector field A' satisfies the properties inferred from A,

$$\operatorname{div} A' = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad n(x) \cdot A' = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \,.$$

Thus, it is a result of the Poincaré Lemma that

$$\|A'\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\operatorname{curl} A'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for some explicit geometric constant $C > 0$.
Now, from the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1, we conclude the result of the corollary. ☐

The next lemma is now an essential step in proving Theorems 1.1-1.5.

Lemma 6.4. *With the notations and hypothesis of Theorem 6.1, and if the magnetic field satisfies*

$$H \leq \lambda m_\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|\,,$$

then we have as $\varepsilon \to 0$,

$$\varepsilon \big\| \, n(x) \cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi \, \big\|_{L^2(\partial N)} \ll 1\,,$$

and

$$\big\| \, [\, \varphi\,]_N \big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1_R)} \ll 1\,.$$

Here $n(x) = \dfrac{x}{|x|}$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, *and* $[\cdot]_N$ *is the jump across* N *introduced in (1.4).*

Proof. Let us introduce the two domains

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = D(0, R-\ell) \setminus D(0, R/2 - \ell), \quad \mathcal{S}_2 = D(0, [R+1]/2 + \ell) \setminus D(0, R+\ell)\,.$$

Notice that the domains $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ can be identified by those corresponding to $\ell = 0$ via the translations

$$T_\pm \ : x = Re^{i\theta} \mapsto (R \pm \ell)e^{i\theta}\,.$$

In order to prove the first statement of the lemma, we have only to establish (thanks to the trace theorem),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \varepsilon \, \| \, |n(x) \cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi| \, \|_{H^1(\mathcal{S}_i)} \ll 1 \quad (\varepsilon \to 0). \tag{6.3}$$

Notice that, by the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1, we have only to estimate $\|\nabla \, |n(x) \cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi| \, \|_{L^2}$.
Notice that since h_ε is radial,

$$n(x) \cdot \nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon = 0,$$

hence

$$n(x) \cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi = n(x) \cdot (\nabla - iA)\varphi\,.$$

Now, one deduces from Corollary 6.3 together with the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1,

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon, \quad \sqrt{\varepsilon}\|A\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon, \quad \sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon, \tag{6.4}$$

and consequently, we obtain

$$\varepsilon\|A \cdot \nabla\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon\| \, |A|^2\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon\,.$$

Now,

$$\Delta\varphi = (\nabla - iA)^2\varphi + 2iA \cdot \nabla\varphi + |A|^2\varphi$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla - iA)^2\varphi &= 2\frac{\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon} \cdot (\nabla - iA)\varphi + (\nabla - iA) \cdot u_\varepsilon^2(\nabla - iA)\varphi \\ &= 2\frac{\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon} \cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi + (\nabla - iA) \cdot u_\varepsilon^2(\nabla - iA)\varphi \\ &\quad [\,\text{since } u_\varepsilon \text{ is radial}\,]\,, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varepsilon \left\| \frac{\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq m_\varepsilon^{-1}\,.$$

Therefore, we deduce from the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1 and the G-L equation of φ that

$$\varepsilon \|\Delta\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon\,.$$

Now, by the standard elliptic regularity theorem, we get

$$\varepsilon \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \ll m_\varepsilon\,. \tag{6.5}$$

Therefore, we obtain,

$$\varepsilon \|(\nabla - iA)\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \ll 1\,.$$

As we have pointed out, this is now sufficient to deduce the first result of the lemma.
We prove now the second statement. Let (r,θ) be polar coordinates. Let us introduce the following function in $[0,2\pi[$,

$$f(\theta) = \varphi\big((R+\ell)e^{i\theta}\big) - \varphi\big((R-\ell)e^{i\theta}\big)\,.$$

We claim that

$$\forall\,\theta \in [0,2\pi[,\quad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} |f(\theta)| = 0\,. \tag{6.6}$$

Actually, by the mean value theorem, we have

$$|f(\theta)| \leq 2\ell\, \|\partial_r \varphi(\cdot,\theta)\|_{L^\infty([R/2,(R+1)/2]}\,.$$

On the other hand, invoking (6.5) and the sobolev embedding theorem, we deduce that

$$|f(\theta)| \ll 2C_\theta \frac{\ell(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\, m_\varepsilon\,,$$

for a constant $C_\theta > 0$.
If $\ell = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, this yields (6.6). Otherwise, if $\ell(\varepsilon) \gg \varepsilon$, we have

$$\frac{\ell}{\varepsilon} m_\varepsilon \leq \frac{\ell}{\varepsilon} \exp\left(\frac{-2\sqrt{a}\,\ell}{\varepsilon}\right) \ll 1,$$

which again yields (6.6).
Now, since $|\varphi|$ has values in $[0,1[$, $\|f(R,\cdot)\|_{L^2([0,2\pi[)}$ is bounded. Therefore, we deduce by the Lebesgue dominate convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|f(R,\cdot)\|_{L^2([0,2\pi[)} = 0,$$

which is nothing but the second statement of the lemma. □

6.2. **Proof of Theorems 1.1-1.5.**

Let us notice that

$$\left| n(x)\cdot \left[\frac{(\nabla - iA)\psi}{\psi} - \frac{\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon} \right] \right| = \frac{1}{|\varphi|} \left| n(x)\cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi \right|\,.$$

Thus, in the regime of Theorem 6.1, we have

$$\varepsilon \left\| n(x)\cdot \left[\frac{(\nabla - iA)\psi}{\psi} - \frac{\nabla u_\varepsilon}{u_\varepsilon} \right] \right\|_{L^2(\partial N)} \leq 2\varepsilon \left\| n(x)\cdot (\nabla - iA')\varphi \right\|_{L^2(\partial N)} \ll 1\,,$$

where the last conclusion is due to Lemma 6.4.
Invoking Theorem 3.2, we deduce the formulas (1.6) and (1.11).
Now, it remains to prove that

$$\big\| \,[\psi]_N\, \big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1_R)} \ll 1\,. \tag{6.7}$$

But, by Lemma 6.4, it is easy to deduce (6.7) since $\psi = u_\varepsilon\,\varphi$, and by Lemma 3.2, u_ε converges uniformly on ∂N to an explicit constant $\mathcal{A} > 0$.

Therefore, we get now that (1.7) and (1.12) hold. This finally achieves the proof of Theorems 1.1 & 1.5. ☐

6.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.6.**

Let $j=(i\psi,(\nabla-iA)\psi)$ and $j_\varphi=(i\varphi,(\nabla-iA)\varphi)$, where $\varphi=\frac{\psi}{u_\varepsilon}$.
Integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_N \operatorname{curl} j_\varphi=\int_{|x|=R+\ell}\tau(x)\cdot j_\varphi-\int_{|x|=R-\ell}\tau(x)\cdot j_\varphi\,,$$

where $\tau(x)=\frac{x^\perp}{|x|}$ is the tangential vector of any circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$.
Notice that $j_\varphi=\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\,j$. Then since the function u_ε is radial and by Theorem 3.2,

$$\|u_\varepsilon-C\|_{L^\infty(\partial N)}\to 0\quad(\text{as }\varepsilon\to 0)$$

for an explicit constant $C>0$, we deduce that

$$\left|\int_{|x|=R+\ell}\tau(x)\cdot j-\int_{|x|=R-\ell}\tau(x)\cdot j\right|=C\left|\int_N \operatorname{curl} j_\varphi\right|(1+o(1))\quad\text{as }\varepsilon\to 0\,.$$

But, since we have no vortices, we get from Point (4) of Proposition 5.2:

$$\int_N \operatorname{curl} j_\varphi=-\int_N \operatorname{curl} A+o(1)\quad(\varepsilon\to 0)\,.$$

Now by the energy estimate of Theorem 6.1, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_N \operatorname{curl} A\right| &\leq |N|^{1/2}\,\|\operatorname{curl} A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}|\ln\varepsilon|.\end{aligned}$$

This achieves the proof of Theorem 1.6. ☐

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank B. Helffer for the interest he owed to this work and for his many valuable suggestions. He would also like to thank E. Sandier for fruitful discussions. This work has been supported by the European Research Network 'Post-doctoral Training Program in Mathematical Analysis of Large Quantum Systems' with contract number HPRN-CT-2002-00277, and the ESF Scientific Programme in Spectral Theory and Partial Differential Equations (SPECT).

APPENDIX A. THE CANONICAL EQUATION

Let $\beta=\beta(a,d)>e^{-\sqrt{2}\,d}$ and $A=A(a,d)>0$ be the solutions of the following equations:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\dfrac{2\sqrt{2}\,\beta\,e^{\sqrt{2}\,d}}{(\beta\,e^{\sqrt{2}\,d}+1)^2}=\sqrt{a}\left[e^{\sqrt{a}\,d}-e^{-\sqrt{a}\,d}\right]A\,,\\[2ex] \dfrac{\beta\,e^{\sqrt{2}\,d}-1}{\beta\,e^{\sqrt{2}\,d}+1}=\left[e^{\sqrt{a}\,d}+e^{-\sqrt{a}\,d}\right]A\,.\end{array}\right.$$

Putting $b = e^{\sqrt{a}\,d} + e^{-\sqrt{a}\,d}$ and $c = \sqrt{a}\left[e^{\sqrt{a}\,d} - e^{-\sqrt{a}\,d}\right]$, the solution (β, A) can be expressed explicitly by,

$$\beta(a,d) = \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{b}{c} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{b}{c}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}}\right) e^{-\sqrt{2}\,d} \tag{A.1}$$

$$A(a,d) = \frac{\beta(a,d)\, e^{\sqrt{2}\,d} - 1}{b\left(\beta(a,d)\, e^{\sqrt{2}\,d} + 1\right)}\,. \tag{A.2}$$

With this choice, it is easily checked that the function U given by (2.2) is a solution of Eq. (2.1). The aim of this appendix is to show that (2.2) is the only bounded and positive solution of (2.1).

Theorem A.1. *In the class of functions* $\mathcal{C} = \{u \in H^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \ : \ u \geq 0\}$, *Eq. (2.1) admits a unique non-trivial solution*

$$\mathbb{R}^2 \ni (x_1, x_2) \mapsto U(x_2)$$

given by (2.2).

Proof. Since the proof is very close to that of [19, Theorem 1.5], we sketch only the main steps.

By adjusting the proof of [19, Lemma 4.2], we obtain that if $u \not\equiv 0$ solves (2.1), then $0 < u < 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. This permits us, when following step by step the proof of [19, Lemma 4.3] and [22, Lemma 5.3], to get a positive constant $C \in]0,1[$ such that for any solution u of (2.1) in $\mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} u(x) > C\,. \tag{A.3}$$

Also, we prove in [19, Lemma 4.4] that, for $u \in \mathcal{C}$ a solution of (2.1),

$$\lim_{x_2\to\pm\infty}\left(\sup_{x_1\in\mathbb{R}}(1 - u(x_1,x_2))\right) = 0\,. \tag{A.4}$$

Now, let $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ be solutions of (2.1). We introduce

$$\lambda_* = \sup\{\lambda \in [0,1[\ : \ u_2(x) > \lambda u_1(x)\}\,. \tag{A.5}$$

Then, by (A.3), $\lambda_* > 0$. We claim that $\lambda_* = 1$. Once this is shown to hold, Theorem A.1 is proved.

We argue by contradiction: If $\lambda_* < 1$, then

$$\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} w(x) = 0\,, \tag{A.6}$$

where $w(x) = u_2(x) - \lambda_* u_1(x)$. Now, let $(x_n) = \left((x_n^1, x_n^2)\right)$ be a minimizing sequence:

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} w(x_n) = 0\,.$$

Since the maximum principle yields that $w(x) > 0$ for all x, the sequence (x_n) should be unbounded, hence we assume that $\lim_{n\to+\infty}|x_n| = +\infty$. Also, by (A.4), (x_n^2) should be bounded, hence we assume that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} x_n^2 = b$.

Now, the functions $u_j^n(x_1,x_2) = u_j(x_1 + x_1^n, x_2)$, $j = 1,2$, solve (2.1) in $\mathcal{C}$, and up to extraction of a subsequence, they converge locally to functions $\widetilde{u}_j \in C^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R} \times \{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-d,d]\})$, $j = 1,2$. Now, $\widetilde{u}_1$, $\widetilde{u}_2$ solve (2.1) in $\mathcal{C}$, $\widetilde{u}_2 \geq \lambda_*\widetilde{u}_1$ and $\widetilde{u}_2(0,b) = \lambda_*\widetilde{u}_1(0,b)$. On the other hand, the strong maximum principle insures that $\widetilde{u}_2(x) > \lambda_*\widetilde{u}_1(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, hence we have a contradiction. □

APPENDIX B. ON THE ENERGY OF A VORTEX CONFIGURATION WITH PINNED VORTICES

In this section we construct a configuration with several vortices on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1_R$, and we discuss the difficulty behind the estimation of its energy. The motivation to construct such a configuration is that we expect vortices of a minimizer of (1.3) to be pinned on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1_R = \partial D(0,R)$, and to be uniformly distributed along this circle.
We cover the unit disc $\Omega = D(0,1)$ uniformly by sectors, each having a small opening. Then we define a periodic induced magnetic field h on the sectors. This magnetic field will be the natural one corresponding to a vortex configuration with a single vortex in each sector. We mention also that similar constructions have been also introduced in the papers [2, 3, 4].

Let (r,θ) be the polar coordinates. Let us take $n = n(\varepsilon)$ equidistant points $(a_i)_{i=1}^N$ on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1_R$ with $\theta(a_1) = 0$. Upon defining the angular sector

$$C_1 = \left\{(r,\theta)\ :\ r \in [0,1[,\quad |\theta| < \frac{2\pi}{n(\varepsilon)}\right\},$$

we get a decomposition of $D(0,1)$ by a family of disjoint sectors (C_i), where each C_i corresponds to the point a_i and is congruent to C_1.

The test configuration.
Now we define a measure μ by:

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if}\quad x \notin \cup_i B(a_i,\varepsilon) \\ \dfrac{2}{\varepsilon^2} & \text{if}\quad x \in \overline{\cup_i B(a_i,\varepsilon)}, \end{cases}$$

and a function h' in $\Omega = D(0,1)$ by

$$\text{(B.1)}\qquad \begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\left(\dfrac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla h'\right) + h' = \mu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ h' = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We notice that

$$\int_{C_i} \mu\,\mathrm{d}x = 2\pi, \quad \forall\ i = 1,2,\cdots N\,.$$

We define an induced magnetic field $h = h' + h_\varepsilon$ (here h_ε has been introduced in (4.4)). Then we define an induced magnetic potential $A = A' + \frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h_\varepsilon$ by taking simply

$$\mathrm{curl}\, A' = h'.$$

This choice is always possible as one can take $A' = \nabla^\perp g$ with $g \in H^2(\Omega)$ such that $\Delta g = h'$.
We turn now to define an order parameter ψ which we take in the form

$$\text{(B.2)}\qquad \psi = u\, u_\varepsilon = \rho\, e^{i\phi}\, u_\varepsilon,$$

where ρ is defined by:

$$\text{(B.3)}\qquad \rho(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if}\quad x \in \cup_i B(a_i,\varepsilon), \\ 1 & \text{if}\quad x \notin \cup_i B(a_i,2\varepsilon), \\ \dfrac{|x-a_i|}{\varepsilon} - 1 & \text{if}\quad \exists\, i \text{ s.t. } x \in B(a_i,2\varepsilon)\setminus B(a_i,\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

The phase ϕ is defined (modulo 2π) by the relation:

$$\text{(B.4)}\qquad \nabla\phi - A' = -\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2}\nabla^\perp h' \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \cup_i B(a_i,\varepsilon),$$

and we emphasize here that we do not need to define ϕ in regions where ρ vanishes.

The energy of the test configuration.
To estimate the energy of the test configuration (ψ, A) constructed above, we express h' by means of a Green's function, i.e. a fundamental solution of the differential operator $-\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\nabla\right)+1$. The existence and the properties of this function, taken from [1, 28], are given in the next lemma.

Lemma B.1. *For every $y \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon \in]0,1]$, there exists a symmetric function $\overline{\Omega}\times\overline{\Omega} \ni (x,y) \mapsto G_\varepsilon(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that :*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{r} -\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\nabla_x G_\varepsilon(x,y)\right)+G_\varepsilon(x,y)=\delta_y(x) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),\\ G_\varepsilon(x,y)\big|_{x\in\partial\Omega}=0.\end{array}\right. \tag{B.5}$$

Moreover, G_ε satisfies the following properties:

(1) *There exists a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$0 \le G_\varepsilon(x,y) \le C_\varepsilon\left(\big|\ln|x-y|\big|+1\right), \quad \forall\,(x,y)\in\overline{\Omega}\times\overline{\Omega}\setminus\Delta,$$

where Δ denotes the diagonal in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

(2) *For any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that, $\forall\,\varepsilon \in]0,\varepsilon_0]$,*

$$\left|G_\varepsilon(x,y)+\frac{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}{2\pi}\ln|x-y|\right| \le C\left\|\frac{|\nabla u_\varepsilon(x)|}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad \forall\, y\in K,\ \forall\, x\in\overline{\Omega}.$$

The field h' can be expressed by means of the function G_ε,

$$h'(x)=\int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(x,y)\,\mu(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\,, \quad \forall\, x\in\Omega. \tag{B.6}$$

By this expression of the field, one is able in the former literature to account for the energy resulting from the interaction of different vortices.
By applying Lemma 6.2, one essentially needs to estimate

$$\int_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{u_\varepsilon^2(x)}|\nabla h'|^2+|h'|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x=\int_{\Omega\times\Omega}G_\varepsilon(x,y)\,\mu(x)\mu(y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{B.7}$$

Unfortunately, due to the rapid oscillation of u_ε, the decay of G_ε in Lemma B.1 is not useful to simulate the energy, since the term $\|\frac{|\nabla u_\varepsilon|}{u_\varepsilon^2}\|_{L^\infty}$ is typically of order ε^{-1}.

Appendix C. Remarks on the Ginzburg-Landau functional

We recall in this appendix some facts taken from [25, 26] concerning the Ginzburg-Landau functional :

$$\mathcal{J}(u,A)=\int_\Omega\left(|(\nabla-iA)u|^2+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}(1-|u|^2)^2+|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\right)\mathrm{d}x, \tag{C.1}$$

defined for functions $(u,A)\in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})\times H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$. Here Ω is a two-dimensional simply connected domain.

Let us start by the following result concerning an estimate of the radius of the set where the modulus of a function u is small, provided that u satisfies some energy bound.

Proposition C.1. *There exist constants $\alpha_0(\Omega) > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that, for any $M > 0$, $\delta > 0$, $\varepsilon \in]0,1[$ satisfying $\varepsilon M/\delta^2 < \alpha_0$, any $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{C})$ and $A \in C^0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying*

$$\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla|u|\,|^2+\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2}(1-|u|^2)\right)\mathrm{d}x \le M,$$

one has the estimate

$$r\big(\{x\in\overline{\Omega}\ :\ |u(x)|\le 1-\delta\}\big)\le C\frac{\varepsilon M}{\delta^2}.$$

The next proposition provides a lower bound of the functional $\mathcal{J}(u,A)$ by means of the degree of u on perforated sets.

Proposition C.2. *Let w be a compact subset of Ω. Then for any $1>\eta>\alpha>r(w)$, there exists a collection of disjoint open balls $(B(a_i,r_i))_i$ such that*

1. $\sum_i r_i\le\eta$ *;*
2. $w\subset\bigcup_i B(a_i,r_i)$ *;*
3. *For any H^1-functions $u\ :\Omega\setminus w\to\mathbb{S}^1$ and $A\ :\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^2$, we have*

$$\int_{B(a_i,r_i)\setminus w}|(\nabla-iA)u|^2\,\mathrm{d}x+r_i\int_{B(a_i,r_i)}|\mathrm{curl}\,A-H|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\ge 2\pi|d_i|\left(\ln\frac{\eta}{\alpha}-\frac{r_i}{2}\right),$$

where $d_i=\deg(u,\partial B(a_i,r_i))$ if $B_i\subset\Omega$ and $d_i=0$ otherwise.

Finally we state a result concerning 'Jacobians'.

Proposition C.3. *Assume that $M>0$, $R>0$, $\gamma\in]0,1]$ and $\delta\in]0,1/2]$. Let $u\in C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{C})$, $A\in C^0(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $(B(a_i,r_i))_i$ a collection of balls such that*

1. $|u|\le 1$ *in* Ω *;*
2. $\mathcal{J}(u,A)\le M$ *;*
3. $\{x\in\overline{\Omega}\ :\ |u(x)|\le 1-\delta\}\subset\bigcup_i B(a_i,r_i)$ *;*
4. $\displaystyle\sum_i r_i<R$ *.*

Then, there exist measures $\alpha\in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ and $\beta\in(C_0^\gamma(\Omega))'$ such that

$$\|\alpha\|_{H_0^{-1}}\le C\,M\delta^2,\quad \|\beta\|_{(C_0^\gamma)'}\le C\,M\,R^\gamma,$$

and, upon putting $d_i=\deg(u,\partial B(a_i,r_i))$ if $B(a_i,r_i)\subset\Omega$ and $d_i=0$ otherwise, we have,

$$4\pi\sum_i d_i\,\delta_{a_i}-\mathrm{curl}\,[(iu,\nabla_A u)+A]=\alpha+\beta.$$

Here $C>0$ is a constant independent of ε, δ, R and M.

References

[1] A. Aftalion, E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. Pinning phenomena in the Ginzburg-Landau model of superconductivity. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **80** 339-372 (2001).

[2] A. Aftalion, S. Alama, L. Bronsard. Giant vortex and the breakdown of strong pinning in a rotating Bose-Einstein condensate. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **178** 247-286 (2005).

[3] S. Alama, L. Bronsard. Vortices and pinning effects for the Ginzburg-Landau model in multiply connected domains. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **LIX** 0036-0070 (2006).

[4] S. Alama, L. Bronsard. Pinning effects and their breakdown for a Ginzburg-Landau model with normal inclusions. *J. Math. Phys.* **46** (9) 095102, 39 pp. (2005).

[5] S. Alama, L. Bronsard, E. Sandier. Global minimizers of the Lawerance-Daniach model with oblique external field. In preparation.

[6] N. André, P. Baumann, D. Phillips. Vortex pinning with bounded fields for the Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Lineaire* **20** 705-729 (2003).

[7] F. Bethuel, H. Brezis, F. Hélein, *Ginzburg-Landau vortices,* Birkhäuser, boston-Basel-Berlin, (1994).

[8] F. Béthuel, T. Rivière. Vortices for a variational problem related to superconductivity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **12** (3) 243-303 (1995).

[9] S.J. Chapman, Q. Du, M.D. Gunzburger. A Ginzburg Landau type model of superconducting/normal junctions including Josephson junctions. *European J. Appl. Math.* **6** (2) 97-114 (1996).

[10] G. Deutscher, P.G. de Gennes. Proximity effects, in *Superconductivity, Vol. 2,* Dekker (1969) 1005-1034, edited by R.D. Parks.

[11] Q. Du, M. Gunzburger, J. Peterson. Analysis and approximation of the Ginzburg-Landau model of superconductivity. *SIAM reviews* **34** 529-560 (1992).

[12] P.G. de Gennes, *Superconductivity of metals and alloys,* Benjamin (1966).

[13] V. Ginzburg, L. Landau. On the theory of superconductivity. *Soviet Phys. JETP* **20** 1064-1082 (1950).

[14] T. Giorgi, H. Jadallah. The onset of superconductivity at a normal/superconducting interface. *Europ. J. Appl. Math.* **17** (2007).

[15] T. Giorgi. Superconductors surrounded by normal materials. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sec. A,* **135** 331-356 (2005).

[16] B. Helffer, A. Morame, Magnetic bottles in connection with superconductivity, *J. Funct. Anal.* **185** (2) 604-680 (2001).

[17] R.L. Jerrard. Lower bounds for generalized Ginzburg-Landau functionals. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **30** (4) 721-746 (1999).

[18] A. Kachmar. Magnetic vortices for a Ginzburg-Landau type energy with discontinuous constraint. Preprint `arXiv:0711.4248`.

[19] A. Kachmar. On the perfect superconducting state for a generalized Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Asymptot. Anal.* **54** (3-4) 125-164 (2007).

[20] A. Kachmar. On the stability of normal states for a generalized Ginzburg-Landau model. *Asymptot. Anal.* **55** (3-4) 145-201 (2007).

[21] L. Lassoued, P. Mironescu. Ginzburg-Landau type energy with discontinuous constraint. *J. Anal. Math.* **77** 1-26 (1999).

[22] K. Lu, X.-B. Pan, Ginzburg-Landau equation with de Gennes boundary condition, *J. Diff. equations* **129** 136-165 (1996).

[23] J. Rubinstein, M. Schatzman, P. Sternberg. Ginzburg-Landau model in thin loops with narrow constrictions. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **64** (6) 2186-2204 (2004).

[24] E. Sandier. Lower bounds for the energy of unit vector fields and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.* **152** (2) 379-403 (1998).

[25] E. Sandier. Vortex analysis of the Ginzburg-Landau model of superconductivity. To appear in the collection *Séminaires et congrès de la SMF.*

[26] E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. *Vortices for the magnetic Ginzburg-Landau model.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 70. Birkhäuser Boston, 2007.

[27] E. Sandier, S. Serfaty. On the energy of type-II superconductors in the mixed phase. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **12** (9) 1219-1257 (2000).

[28] G. Stampacchia. Équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus. Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures, No. 16 (Été, 1965). *Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, Que. 326 pp. 1966).*

[29] M. Tinkham. *Introduction to superconductivity.* McGraw-Hill, (1996).